



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,535	03/31/2004	Daewoong Suh	042390.P18729	9982

8791 7590 04/29/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

LAM, CATHY FONG FONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,535

Applicant(s)

SUH, DAEWOONG

Examiner

Cathy Lam

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 8, 9 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-10 & 25-28, drawn to a microtool, classified in class 428, subclass 61.
  - II. Claims 11-24, drawn to a method of making a microtool, classified in class 264, subclass 107.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a different process such as by extrusion molding a nickel base material with recesses on one surface, then vacuum plating a nickel composite material over the nickel base material. The process as claimed can be used to make a different product such as an optical disc.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Atty: Arlen Hartounian on April 19<sup>th</sup> 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-10 & 25-28. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying

to this Office action. Claims 11-24 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Isono et al (US 5458985).

It is noted by the Examiner that some claims involve process limitations, such as “electroless nickel layer”, “nickel layer has been annealed”, etc. It is the product itself which must be new and unobvious. Unless some unexpected result is shown that occurs due to Applicant’s specific process(es), different processing steps are not patentably distinguishing for claims to an article.

Isono discloses a tool (or a stamper) comprised of a base layer (8) and a metal composite (3,4,5) deposited over the base layer (8).

The base layer (8) that is made from the electroformed layer (7) is formed of nickel (col 5 L 39-43). The examiner is taking the position that the base layer is a pure nickel.

The metal composite is made of a plurality of metal layers such as nickel/tantalum or chrome/nickel layer system (col 3 L 42-46 & col 4 L 4-6).

Isono's stamper is used in making a plastic substrate having a groove pattern (col 1 L 11-14).

The metal composite layer (ie. nickel/tantalum/nickel layer all added together is 850 or (0.085  $\mu\text{m}$ ) (col 6 L 10-14).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isono et al (US 5458985).

Isono discloses a stamper comprised of a metal base (8) and a metal composite layer (3,4,5). Isono teaches that the metal base (8) is a nickel material, but is silent about metal base (8) could be a nickel alloy material.

In view of the prior art teaching, it would have been obvious to choose a nickel alloy because alloy metal has a higher melting point which gives a greater hardness than a pure metal.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 4, 8-9 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if incorporate into independent claims.

Art Unit: 1775

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cathy Lam whose telephone number is (571) 272-1538. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Cathy Lam  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1775

cfl  
April 22, 2005